



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,625	11/20/2001	Scott Montgomery	080839-0380626	3428

909 7590 08/04/2011
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3628

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

08/04/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket_ip@pillsburylaw.com
margaret.drosos@pillsburylaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/990,625	Applicant(s) MONTGOMERY ET AL.	
	Examiner AKIBA ROBINSON BOYCE	Art Unit 3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8,9,12-24,26-38,40-42,44,45,55 and 56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8,9,12-24,26-38,40-42,44,45,55 and 56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Due to communications filed 5/23/11, the following is a final office action. Claims 2, 7, 10-11, 25, 39, 43, 46-47 and 49-54 are cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 12-15, 17, 18, 21-23, 27-29, 33, 38, 42, 48 are amended. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 12-24, 26-38, 40-42, 44, 45, and 55-56 are pending in this application, and have been examined on the merits. The previous rejection has been modified to reflect claim amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, 12-14, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovlakas (US 20030089765 A1), and further in view of Williams et al (US 7774284).

As per claim 1, Kovlakas discloses:

Art Unit: 3628

generating, at a postage-issuing computer system, a unique postage indicium in response to receiving a request for a postage purchase transaction, ([0027] FIG. 5 is a flow chart for the recording and upload transactions of postal security device 45 and computer 47 of FIG. 3. In block 200 the print job begins, i.e., the printing of mail piece 21 including indicia 24. Then the program goes to decision block 201. Block 201 determines whether or not the print data is mail piece and postage information. If block 201 determines that the print data is not mail piece and postage information, the program goes back to the input of block 201. If block 201 determines that the print data is mail piece and postage information, the program goes to block 202. Block 202 will encrypt and save information that "uniquely" identifies mail piece 21, including information related to the mailer or personal computer meter such as the date and time that indicia 24 is produced; the amount of postage indicated in indicia 24; the serial number of postal security device 45 or the number that data center 48 uses to identify computer 47, also, in Fig. 6, the mailer/meter identifier, and mailpiece identification data are used to track whether the mailpiece has been mailed, which examiner interprets as tracking capability, also see claim 9 of Kovlakas where it shows wherein the information that uniquely identifies each mail piece comprises: a identification number that identifies the computer that requested the production of the postal indicia)

storing information for the postage purchase transaction in a database coupled to the postage-issuing computer system, wherein the information stored for the postage purchase transaction includes the unique tracking identifier that provides the mail piece

Art Unit: 3628

tracking capability within the USPS and a delivery status associated with the unique tracking identifier, (Fig. 6, [301], scan the unmailable postage evidenced mailpiece, [0007] This invention overcomes the disadvantages of the prior art by providing a method that will easily and automatically recover postage that has been debited to the mailer's meter for mail pieces that are not going to be posted. The foregoing is accomplished by *scanning* and extracting information from a postage-evidenced mail piece that can be used to uniquely identify a mail piece and validate the postage evidence. This information is then reconciled against centralized or distributed remote logs of postage transactions and tracking information to determine if the mail piece has already been entered into the postal mailstream and protected against fraud);

retrieving the information stored for the postage purchase transaction from the database in response to the postage-issuing computer system receiving a refund inquiry for the postage purchase transaction, wherein the information retrieved for the postage purchase transaction from the database includes the delivery status associated with the unique tracking identifier, ([0007] This invention overcomes the disadvantages of the prior art by providing a method that will easily and automatically recover postage that has been debited to the mailer's meter for mail pieces that are not going to be posted. The foregoing is accomplished by scanning and *extracting* information from a postage-evidenced mail piece that can be used to uniquely identify a mail piece and validate the postage evidence. This information is then reconciled against centralized or distributed remote logs of postage transactions and tracking information to determine if the mail

Art Unit: 3628

piece has already been entered into the postal mailstream and protected against fraud Fig. 6, [305]-[308], shows extracting mailpiece identification data and as a result of determining if the scanned transaction exists in the transaction log, determining if mailpiece has been mailed, where examiner interprets the determination if the mailpiece has been mailed as the delivery status, also, see claim 1 of Kovlakas)

refunding the postage purchase transaction based on the delivery status associated with the unique tracking identifier, (Fig. 6, [311], issue credit for postage amount scanned).

Kovlakas does not specifically disclose wherein the unique postage indicium contains a unique tracking identifier to track a mailpiece delivery status within the United States Postal Service, but does disclose the use of the mailer/meter identifier and mailpiece identification data (which is part of the unique indicium) to search the transaction log for tracking information to determine whether or not the mailpiece has been mailed as shown in [0007] and Fig. 6, and therefore suggest tracking identifier.

However, Williams et al discloses a postal return system in FIGS. 30a-30c. Also, in col. 56, line 52-col. 52, line 14, shows the creation of a System tracking number which is linked to the Package Tracking Table, which further allows for the determination of the specification of the tracking state of the package. In addition, col. 43, line 59-col. 44, line 3 shows that "A System tracking number is a unique number generated internally by the System to identify a particular package shipped using the

Art Unit: 3628

System. The Shipper inputs the Shipper's Parcel Specifications for the Subject Parcel. Using each Shipper's Parcel Specifications, the System is programmed to access databases containing information about each supported Carrier. Each supported Carrier has a unique rating schedule, delivery and pickup rules and schedules”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the unique postage indicium contains a unique tracking identifier to track a mailpiece delivery status within the United States Postal Service with the motivation of providing data within the postage indicium for tracking the mailpiece.

As per claim 4, Kovlakas discloses:

receiving confirmatory delivery status information associated with the unique tracking identifier from the USPS, wherein the confirmatory delivery status information indicates whether the USPS has delivered a mail piece carrying the unique tracking identifier, (Fig 6, [308], this step determines if mailpiece has been mailed); and

updating the mailpiece delivery status associated with the unique tracking identifier in the database with the confirmatory status information received from the USPS, (Fig 6, [310], void the transaction in the transaction log if it is determined that mailpiece has not been mailed)).

As per claim 5, Kovlakas discloses:

wherein the information stored for the postage purchase transaction further includes a date and the unique postage indicium for the postage purchase transaction, ([0014] Referring now to the drawings in detail, and more particularly to FIG. 1, the reference character 11 represents a mail piece that has a recipient address field 12 and a sender address field 13. A postal indicia 14 that was made by an electronic meter is affixed to mail piece 11. Indicia 14 contains a dollar amount 15; the date 16 that postal indicia 14 was affixed to mail piece 11).

As per claim 6, Kovlakas discloses:

wherein the information stored for the postage purchase transaction further includes a date, a time, a destination zip code, a service class, a postage amount, a mail piece weight, and the unique postage indicium for the postage purchase transaction, ([0027] FIG. 5 is a flow chart for the recording and upload transactions of postal security device 45 and computer 47 of FIG. 3. In block 200 the print job begins, i.e., the printing of mail piece 21 including indicia 24. Then the program goes to decision block 201. Block 201 determines whether or not the print data is mail piece and postage information. If block 201 determines that the print data is not mail piece and postage information, the program goes back to the input of block 201. If block 201 determines that the print data is mail piece and postage information, the program goes to block 202. Block 202 will encrypt and save information that "uniquely" identifies mail piece 21, including information related to the mailer or personal computer meter such as the date and time that indicia 24 is produced;).

Kovlakas does not disclose a service class or a mail piece weight, however, Lewis discloses in col. 19, lines 5-18 "Additional information may be required such as the Class of postage by which the mail piece(s) will be shipped and the method of calculating the postage. The system may be established so that the user selects Calculate Weight, whereupon the number of sheets of paper being mailed and a paper weight (as indicated on the paper packaging (e.g., envelope, box, etc.)) are entered. A suitable application will then calculate the total weight by referring to an algorithm resident in the downloaded client software, for example, multiplying the single sheet paper weight by the number of sheets indicated. The result is then added to the weight of the packaging (e.g., an envelope) via a table look-up. The postage for that weight and class is then determined and the list of addresses is updated." It would have been obvious to combine Kovlakas and Lewis to disclose a service class or a mail piece weight.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose a service class or a mail piece weight with the motivation of including standard mailpiece data with the postage purchase transaction.

As per claims 8, 9, Kovlakas does not specifically disclose wherein the refund inquiry is received from an account administrator that operates a user interface at the postage-issuing computer system, however, Lewis discloses in Col. 25, line 46, a

Art Unit: 3628

system's administrator. It would have been obvious to combine Kovlakas and Lewis to disclose wherein the refund inquiry is received from an account administrator that operates a user interface at the postage-issuing computer system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the refund inquiry is received from an account administrator that operates a user interface at the postage-issuing computer system, with the motivation of providing an entity to take charge of processing.

As per claims 12, Kovlakas discloses:

refunding the postage purchase transaction in response to determining that the mail piece delivery status associated with the unique tacking identifier indicates that the USPS has not delivered a mail piece carrying with the unique tracking identifier; and denying the refund inquiry in response to determining that the delivery status associated with the unique tacking identifier indicates that the USPS has delivered the mail piece carrying the unique tracking identifier, (Fig. 6, [308]-[311]).

As per claim 13, Kovlakas discloses:

receiving confirmatory delivery status information associated with the unique tracking identifier from the USPS in response to the USPS processing a mail piece-the unique tracking identifier and reading the unique tracking; identifier carried on the mail piece, ((Fig 6, [308], this step determines if mailpiece has been mailed); and

updating mail piece the delivery status associated with the unique tracking identifier to

Art Unit: 3628

indicate that the USPS has delivered the mail piece carrying the unique tracking identifier, reading the USPS tracking ID on the mail piece, (Fig 6, ([310], void the transaction in the transaction log if it is determined that mailpiece has not been mailed).

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovlakas (US 20030089765 A1), and further in view of Williams et al (US 7774284), and further in view of Lewis et al (US 6233565).

As per claim 3, Kovlakas does not specifically disclose displaying the information retrieved for the postage purchase transaction from the database at the postage-issuing computer system in response to the refund inquiry for the postage purchase transaction, however, Lewis does disclose a refund process where customer requests a full refund and a display screen assists the customer in doing so as shown in Col. 17, lines 41-66. It therefore would be obvious to combine Kovlakas and Lewis to disclose displaying the information retrieved for the postage purchase transaction from the database at the postage-issuing computer system in response to the refund inquiry for the postage purchase transaction.

It would have been obvious to disclose displaying the information retrieved for the postage purchase transaction from the database at the postage-issuing computer system in response to the refund inquiry for the postage purchase transaction with the

Art Unit: 3628

motivation of providing a user with visual means to request and process a refund transaction.

5. Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovlakas (US 20030089765 A1), and further in view of Williams et al (US 7774284), and further in view of Whitehouse (US 6,005,945).

As per claims 14, Kovlakas discloses:

refunding the postage purchase transaction in response to determining that the mail piece delivery status associated with the unique tacking identifier indicates that the USPS has not delivered a mail piece carrying with the unique tracking identifier; and denying the refund inquiry in response to determining that the delivery status associated with the unique tacking identifier indicates that the USPS has delivered the mail piece carrying the unique tracking identifier, (Fig. 6, [308]-[311]).

6. Claims 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 45, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovlakas (US 20030089765 A1), and further in view of Williams et al (US 7774284), and further in view of Whitehouse (US 6,005,945), and further in view of Gordon (6,527, 128).

As per claim 15, Kovlakas discloses:

generating, at a postage-issuing computer system, a first unique postage indicium in response to receiving a first request for a first postage purchase transaction, ([0027]

FIG. 5 is a flow chart for the recording and upload transactions of postal security device 45 and computer 47 of FIG. 3. In block 200 the print job begins, i.e., the printing of mail piece 21 including indicia 24. Then the program goes to decision block 201. Block 201 determines whether or not the print data is mail piece and postage information. If block 201 determines that the print data is not mail piece and postage information, the program goes back to the input of block 201. If block 201 determines that the print data is mail piece and postage information, the program goes to block 202. Block 202 will encrypt and save information that "uniquely" identifies mail piece 21, including information related to the mailer or personal computer meter such as the date and time that indicia 24 is produced; the amount of postage indicated in indicia 24; the serial number of postal security device 45 or the number that data center 48 uses to identify computer 47, also, in Fig. 6, the mailer/meter identifier, and mailpiece identification data are used to track whether the mailpiece has been mailed, which examiner interprets as tracking capability, also see claim 9 of Kovlakas where it shows wherein the information that uniquely identifies each mail piece comprises: a identification number that identifies the computer that requested the production of the postal indicia);

storing information for the first postage purchase transaction in a database coupled to the postage-issuing computer system, a first date for the first postage purchase

Art Unit: 3628

transaction, and a first delivery status, (Fig. 6, [301], scan the unmailable postage evidenced mailpiece, [0007] This invention overcomes the disadvantages of the prior art by providing a method that will easily and automatically recover postage that has been debited to the mailer's meter for mail pieces that are not going to be posted. The foregoing is accomplished by *scanning* and extracting information from a postage-evidenced mail piece that can be used to uniquely identify a mail piece and validate the postage evidence. This information is then reconciled against centralized or distributed remote logs of postage transactions and tracking information to determine if the mail piece has already been entered into the postal mailstream and protected against fraud, where a first delivery status is represented by whether or not mailpiece has been mailed as shown in Fig. 6, where the use of the mailer/meter identifier and mailpiece identification data (which is part of the unique indicium) to search the transaction log for tracking information to determine whether or not the mailpiece has been mailed as also shown in [0007], also, [0014] Referring now to the drawings in detail, and more particularly to FIG. 1, the reference character 11 represents a mail piece that has a recipient address field 12 and a sender address field 13. A postal indicia 14 that was made by an electronic meter is affixed to mail piece 11. Indicia 14 contains a dollar amount 15; the date 16 that postal indicia 14 was affixed to mail piece 11);

retrieving the information stored for the first postage purchase transaction from the database in response to the postage-issuing computer system receiving a refund inquiry for the first postage purchase transaction, wherein the information retrieved for the first

Art Unit: 3628

postage purchase transaction from the database includes the first delivery status associated with the first unique tracking identifier and the first date for the first postage purchase transaction, ([0007] This invention overcomes the disadvantages of the prior art by providing a method that will easily and automatically recover postage that has been debited to the mailer's meter for mail pieces that are not going to be posted. The foregoing is accomplished by scanning and *extracting* information from a postage-evidenced mail piece that can be used to uniquely identify a mail piece and validate the postage evidence. This information is then reconciled against centralized or distributed remote logs of postage transactions and tracking information to determine if the mail piece has already been entered into the postal mailstream and protected against fraud Fig. 6, [305]-[308], shows extracting mailpiece identification data and as a result of determining if the scanned transaction exists in the transaction log, determining if mailpiece has been mailed, where examiner interprets the determination if the mailpiece has been mailed as the delivery status, also, see claim 1 of Kovlakas); and

refunding the first postage purchase transaction in response to determining that the first delivery status associated with the first unique tracking identifier indicates that the USPS has not delivered a mail piece carrying the first unique tracking identifier, (Fig. 6, [311], issue credit for postage amount scanned).

.

Kovlakas does not specifically disclose wherein the first unique postage indicium contains a first unique tracking identifier to track a first mail piece delivery status within

Art Unit: 3628

the United States Postal Service (USPS), but does disclose the use of the mailer/meter identifier and mailpiece identification data (which is part of the unique indicium) to search the transaction log for tracking information to determine whether or not the mailpiece has been mailed as shown in [0007] and Fig. 6, and therefore suggest tracking identifier. However, Williams et al discloses a postal return system in FIGS. 30a-30c. Also, in col. 56, line 52-col. 52, line 14, shows the creation of a System tracking number which is linked to the Package Tracking Table, which further allows for the determination of the specification of the tracking state of the package. In addition, col. 43, line 59-col. 44, line 3 shows that "A System tracking number is a unique number generated internally by the System to identify a particular package shipped using the System. The Shipper inputs the Shipper's Parcel Specifications for the Subject Parcel. Using each Shipper's Parcel Specifications, the System is programmed to access databases containing information about each supported Carrier. Each supported Carrier has a unique rating schedule, delivery and pickup rules and schedules"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the first unique postage indicium contains a first unique tracking identifier to track a first mail piece delivery status within the United States Postal Service (USPS), with the motivation of providing data within the postage indicium for tracking the mailpiece.

Neither Kovlakas nor Williams et al specifically disclose the following, however, Whitehouse discloses in the Abstract, lines 10-15, a database of information concerning

Art Unit: 3628

user accounts [plural], and also, in Col. 28, lines 21-23, general postal indicia based on a plurality of user accounts, and also in Col. 25, lines 5-17, request a refund/issue a refund. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Kovlakas, Williams et al, and Whitehouse to disclose the following:

generating, at the, postage-issuing computer system, a second unique postage indicium in response to receiving a second request for a second postage purchase transaction, wherein the second unique postage indicium contains a second unique tracking identifier that provides the mail piece tracking capability within the United States Postal Service (USPS);

storing information for the second postage purchase transaction in the database, wherein the information stored for the second postage purchase transaction includes the second unique tracking identifier that provides the mail piece tracking capability within the USPS, a second date for the second postage purchase transaction, and a second delivery status associated with the second unique tracking identifier;

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose the above limitations in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that the postal service can deal with a plurality of postage purchase transactions for a plurality of user accounts, and does not issue refunds for postage indicia that was previously used.

Neither Kovlakas nor Williams et al nor Whitehouse specifically disclose associating the information stored for the first postage purchase transaction and the

Art Unit: 3628

information stored for the second postage purchase transaction with a user account at the postage-issuing computer system and that the first date for the first postage purchase transaction is the same as the second date for the second postage purchase transaction/a first delivery status associated with the first unique tracking number/to track a second mail piece delivery status within the United States Postal Service (USPS)/track the second mail piece delivery status within the USPS, however, in the abstract, Gordon discloses that counterfeit indicia are identified through a comparison of the stored information in the master log database with information scanned from the mailpiece itself, and that counterfeits may also be detected by recognizing the multiple occurrences of identical indicia. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Kovlakas, Williams et al, Whitehouse and Gordon to disclose associating the information stored for the first postage purchase transaction and the information stored for the second postage purchase transaction with a user account at the postage-issuing computer system and that the first date for the first postage purchase transaction is the same as the second date for the second postage purchase transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose the above limitations with the motivation of determining if multiple transactions are processed at a time.

As per claim 17, Kovlakas discloses:

receiving confirmatory delivery status information associated with one or more of the first unique tracking identifier or the second unique identifier from the

Art Unit: 3628

USPS, wherein the confirmatory delivery status information indicates whether the USPS has delivered the mailpiece carrying the first unique tracking identifier or another mail piece carrying the second unique tracking identifier, ((Fig 6, [308], this step determines if mailpiece has been mailed); and

updating one or more of the first mailpiece delivery status associated with the first unique tracking identifier or the second mailpiece delivery status associated with the second unique tracking identifier in the database with the confirmatory delivery status information received from the USPS, (Fig. 6, [310], void the transaction in the transaction log if it is determined that mailpiece has not been mailed)

As per claims 18, 34, Kovlakas does not specifically disclose

Receiving confirmatory delivery status information associated with the first unique tracking identifier in response to processing the mail piece carrying the first unique tracking identifier and reading the first unique tracking identifier carried on the mail piece, (Col.5, lines 32-33, and Fig 3B shows that delivery confirmation 254 is affixed to label 251 on the package [where label 251 contains the unique code used for tracking purposes); and

updating the first mailpiece delivery status associated with the first unique tracking identifier to indicate that the USPS has delivered the mail piece carrying the first unique tracking identifier, (Fig. 6, [310], void the transaction in the transaction log if it is determined that mailpiece has not been mailed).

Art Unit: 3628

As per claims 22, Kovlakas discloses:

refunding the postage purchase transaction in response to determining that the delivery status associated with the unique tacking identifier indicates that the USPS has not delivered a mail piece carrying with the unique tracking identifier; and denying the refund inquiry in response to determining that the mailpiece delivery status associated with the unique tacking identifier indicates that the USPS has delivered the mail piece carrying the unique tracking identifier, (Fig. 6, [308]-[311]).

As per claims 21, Kovlakas discloses:

receiving confirmatory delivery status information associated with the unique tracking identifier from the USPS in response to the USPS processing a mail piece-the unique tracking identifier and reading the unique tracking; identifier carried on the mail piece, ((Fig 6, [308], this step determines if mailpiece has been mailed); and

updating the second mail piece delivery status associated with the second unique tracking identifier to indicate that the USPS has delivered the other mail piece carrying the second unique tracking identifier, Fig 6, [310], void the transaction in the transaction log if it is determined that mailpiece has not been mailed).

As per claim 23, Kovlakas discloses:

generating, at a postage-issuing computer system, a first unique postage indicium in response to receiving a first request for a first postage purchase transaction, ([0027]

FIG. 5 is a flow chart for the recording and upload transactions of postal security device

Art Unit: 3628

45 and computer 47 of FIG. 3. In block 200 the print job begins, i.e., the printing of mail piece 21 including indicia 24. Then the program goes to decision block 201. Block 201 determines whether or not the print data is mail piece and postage information. If block 201 determines that the print data is not mail piece and postage information, the program goes back to the input of block 201. If block 201 determines that the print data is mail piece and postage information, the program goes to block 202. Block 202 will encrypt and save information that "uniquely" identifies mail piece 21, including information related to the mailer or personal computer meter such as the date and time that indicia 24 is produced; the amount of postage indicated in indicia 24; the serial number of postal security device 45 or the number that data center 48 uses to identify computer 47, also, in Fig. 6, the mailer/meter identifier, and mailpiece identification data are used to track whether the mailpiece has been mailed, which examiner interprets as tracking capability, also see claim 9 of Kovlakas where it shows wherein the information that uniquely identifies each mail piece comprises: a identification number that identifies the computer that requested the production of the postal indicia);

storing information for the first postage purchase transaction in a database coupled to the postage-issuing computer system, wherein the information stored for the first postage purchase transaction includes the first unique tracking identifier that provides the mail piece tracking capability within the USPS, a first date for the first postage purchase transaction, a first destination zip code for the first postage purchase transaction, a first postage amount for the first postage, .transaction, and a first delivery

Art Unit: 3628

status associated with the first unique tracking identifier, (Fig. 6, [301], scan the unmailable postage evidenced mailpiece, [0007] This invention overcomes the disadvantages of the prior art by providing a method that will easily and automatically recover postage that has been debited to the mailer's meter for mail pieces that are not going to be posted. The foregoing is accomplished by *scanning* and extracting information from a postage-evidenced mail piece that can be used to uniquely identify a mail piece and validate the postage evidence. This information is then reconciled against centralized or distributed remote logs of postage transactions and tracking information to determine if the mail piece has already been entered into the postal mailstream and protected against fraud, where a first delivery status is represented by whether or not mailpiece has been mailed as shown in Fig. 6, where the use of the mailer/meter identifier and mailpiece identification data (which is part of the unique indicium) to search the transaction log for tracking information to determine whether or not the mailpiece has been mailed as also shown in [0007], also, [0014] Referring now to the drawings in detail, and more particularly to FIG. 1, the reference character 11 represents a mail piece that has a recipient address field 12 and a sender address field 13. A postal indicia 14 that was made by an electronic meter is affixed to mail piece 11. Indicia 14 contains a dollar amount 15; the date 16 that postal indicia 14 was affixed to mail piece 11);

Art Unit: 3628

refunding the postage purchase transaction identified in the refund inquiry in response to the delivery status indicating that the USPS has delivered a mail piece carrying, (Fig. 6, [308]-[311]).

Kovlakas does not specifically disclose wherein the first unique postage indicium contains a first unique tracking identifier that provides a mail piece tracking capability within the United States Postal Service (USPS), but does disclose the use of the mailer/meter identifier and mailpiece identification data (which is part of the unique indicium) to search the transaction log for tracking information to determine whether or not the mailpiece has been mailed as shown in [0007] and Fig. 6, and therefore suggest tracking identifier.

However, Williams et al discloses a postal return system in FIGS. 30a-30c. Also, in col. 56, line 52-col. 52, line 14, shows the creation of a System tracking number which is linked to the Package Tracking Table, which further allows for the determination of the specification of the tracking state of the package. In addition, col. 43, line 59-col. 44, line 3 shows that "A System tracking number is a unique number generated internally by the System to identify a particular package shipped using the System. The Shipper inputs the Shipper's Parcel Specifications for the Subject Parcel. Using each Shipper's Parcel Specifications, the System is programmed to access databases containing information about each supported Carrier. Each supported Carrier has a unique rating schedule, delivery and pickup rules and schedules"

Art Unit: 3628

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the unique postage indicium contains a unique tracking identifier to track a mailpiece delivery status within the United States Postal Service with the motivation of providing data within the postage indicium for tracking the mailpiece.

Neither Kovlakas nor Williams et al specifically disclose the following, however, Whitehouse discloses in the Abstract, lines 10-15, a database of information concerning user accounts [plural], and also, in Col. 28, lines 21-23, general postal indicia based on a plurality of user accounts, and also in Col. 25, lines 5-17, request a refund/issue a refund. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Kovlakas, Williams et al and Whitehouse to disclose the following:

generating, at the postage-issuing computer system, a second unique postage indicium in response to receiving a second request for a second postage purchase transaction, wherein the second unique postage indicium contains a second unique tracking identifier that provides the mail piece tracking capability within the United States Postal Service (USPS);

storing information for the second postage purchase transaction in the database, wherein the information stored for the second postage purchase transaction includes the second unique tracking identifier that provides the mail piece tracking capability

Art Unit: 3628

within the USPS, a second date for the second postage purchase transaction, a second destination zip, code for the second postage purchase transaction, a second postage amount for the second postage purchase transaction, and a second delivery status associated with the second unique tracking, identifier;

first and second delivery status

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose the above limitations in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that the postal service can deal with a plurality of postage purchase transactions for a plurality of user accounts, and does not issue refunds for postage indicia that was previously used.

Neither Kovlakas nor Williams et al specifically disclose in response to receiving a first request for a first postage purchase transaction, wherein the first unique postage indicium contains a first unique tracking; identifier that provides a mail piece tracking, capability, however, Gordon, in col. 4, lines 46-65, shows a request for postage where Part of the processing of this request ensures that proper payment for the postage has been received and Once the request for postage has been fully processed within the postal authority 10, the cryptographically secured or plain text postage indicia is transmitted 16 to the mailer and col. 5, lines 20-32 shows that, as part of the request 14, the mailer 12 transmit recipient address information to the postal authority 10. The

Art Unit: 3628

postal authority 10 then associates the recipient address information with the indicia created therein and stores this information in a master log database 20, and at this point, the master log database stores the associated indicia and recipient address information in an indexed fashion within the database, where the postage indicia contains a serial or transaction number which may be utilized to index the master log database. It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Kovlakas, Williams et al and Gordon to disclose generating , a unique postage indicium in response to receiving a request for a postage purchase transaction, wherein the unique postage indicium contains a unique tracking identifier that provides a mail piece tracking capability with the motivation of showing that unique indicium is used to track packages.

Neither Kovlakas nor Williams et al nor Whitehouse specifically disclose searching the database for the information stored for the first postage purchase transaction and the information stored for the second postage purchase transaction in response to the postage-issuing computer system receiving a refund inquiry identifying; one of, wherein the first postage purchase transaction or the second postage purchase transaction; identifying the first postage purchase transaction and the second *postage*, transactions as duplicative postage purchase transactions in response to determining that the first date., the first destination zip code, and the first postage amount for the first postal transaction are respectively identical to the second date, the second destination zip code, and the second postage amount for the second postage purchase transaction or only one of the first unique tracking identifier or the second unique tracking identifier

Art Unit: 3628

associated with the duplicative postage purchase transactions, however, in the abstract, Gordon discloses that counterfeit indicia are identified through a comparison of the stored information in the master log database with information scanned from the mailpiece itself, and that counterfeits may also be detected by recognizing the multiple occurrences of identical indicia. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Kovlakas, Willimas et al, Whitehouse and Gordon to disclose the above limitations.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose the above limitations with the motivation of determining if multiple transactions are processed at a time.

As per claims 27, 42, Kovlakas discloses:

receiving confirmatory delivery status information associated with the unique tracking identifier from the USPS in response to the USPS processing a mail piece-the unique tracking identifier and reading the unique tracking; identifier carried on the mail piece, ((Fig 6, [308], this step determines if mailpiece has been mailed); and

updating the delivery status associated with the unique tracking identifier to indicate that the USPS has delivered the mail piece carrying the unique tracking identifier, reading the USPS tracking ID on the mail piece, (Fig 6, ([310], void the transaction in the transaction log if it is determined that mailpiece has not been mailed).

As per claim 24, neither Kovlakas nor Williams et al does not specifically disclose associating the information stored for the first postage purchase transaction and the

Art Unit: 3628

information stored for the second postage purchase transaction, with one or more user accounts at the postage-issuing computer system, but Gordon discloses that counterfeit indicia are identified through a comparison of the stored information in the master log database with information scanned from the mailpiece itself, and that counterfeits may also be detected by recognizing the multiple occurrences of identical indicia. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Kovlakas, Williams et al and Gordon to disclose associating the information stored for the first postage purchase transaction and the information stored for the second postage purchase transaction with a user account at the postage-issuing computer system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose the above limitation with the motivation of determining if multiple transactions are processed at a time.

As per claim 26, Kovlakas discloses:

wherein the information stored for the first postage purchase transaction further includes-a first postage purchase transaction time, and the first unique postage indicium for the first postage purchase transaction, ([0027] FIG. 5 is a flow chart for the recording and upload transactions of postal security device 45 and computer 47 of FIG. 3. In block 200 the print job begins, i.e., the printing of mail piece 21 including indicia 24. Then the program goes to decision block 201. Block 201 determines whether or not the print data is mail piece and postage information. If block 201 determines that the print data is not mail piece and postage information, the program goes back to the input of block 201. If block 201 determines that the print data is mail piece and postage information, the

Art Unit: 3628

program goes to block 202. Block 202 will encrypt and save information that "uniquely" identifies mail piece 21, including information related to the mailer or personal computer meter such as the date and time that indicia 24 is produced;).

Kovlakas does not disclose a service class or a mail piece weight, however, Lewis discloses in col. 19, lines 5-18 "Additional information may be required such as the Class of postage by which the mail piece(s) will be shipped and the method of calculating the postage. The system may be established so that the user selects Calculate Weight, whereupon the number of sheets of paper being mailed and a paper weight (as indicated on the paper packaging (e.g., envelope, box, etc.)) are entered. A suitable application will then calculate the total weight by referring to an algorithm resident in the downloaded client software, for example, multiplying the single sheet paper weight by the number of sheets indicated. The result is then added to the weight of the packaging (e.g., an envelope) via a table look-up. The postage for that weight and class is then determined and the list of addresses is updated." It would have been obvious to combine Kovlakas and Lewis to disclose a service class or a mail piece weight.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose a service class or a mail piece weight with the motivation of including standard mailpiece data with the postage purchase transaction.

Neither Kovlakas nor Lewis specifically disclose the following, however, Whitehouse discloses in the Abstract, lines 10-15, a database of information concerning user accounts [plural], and also, in Col. 28, lines 21-23, general postal indicia based on

Art Unit: 3628

a plurality of user accounts, and also in Col. 25, lines 5-17, request a refund/issue a refund. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Kovlakas, Lewis, Gordon and Whitehouse to disclose the following:

wherein the information stored for the second postage, transaction further includes a second time, a second service class, a second mail piece weight, and the second unique postage, indicium for the second postage purchase transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose the above limitations in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that the postal service can deal with a plurality of postage purchase transactions for a plurality of user accounts, and does not issue refunds for postage indicia that was previously used.

As per claim 29, Kovlakas discloses:

request confirmatory delivery status information wherein associated with one or more of the respective unique tracking identifiers from the master tracking computer system; receive the requested confirmatory delivery status information associated with the one or more respective unique tracking identifiers from the master tracking computer system, wherein the confirmatory delivery status information indicates whether the USPS has delivered one or more mail pieces carrying the one or more respective unique tracking identifiers; and update the mailpiece delivery statuses respectively associated with the one or more respective unique tracking; identifiers in the database with the confirmatory delivery status information received from the master

Art Unit: 3628

tracking computer system, (Fig 6, see results of [308] (yes or no), and [310], void the transaction in the transaction log if it is determined that mailpiece has not been mailed)).

As per claim 44, Kovlakas does not specifically disclose wherein executing the data processing circuitry on the postage-issuing computer system further causes the postage-issuing computer system to filter out the refunded postage purchase transactions from the duplicative postage purchase transactions to prevent the filtered postage purchase transactions from receiving multiple refunds, however, Lewis in col. 8, lines 7-37 discloses "Referring also to FIG. 2, to protect the various components from unauthorized access and intrusion, the PSP 4 is provided with an inbound network 110 and an outbound network 130. The inbound network 110 allows a customer 2n to securely access the RSP web server 150. The outbound network 130 allows for the secure exchange of financial transactions executed between the customer 2n and the TPS 6 directly and/or indirectly through RSP 4. Network traffic in and out of these networks is controlled by a conventional inbound router 112 and an outbound router 132, which will operate to filter out all unauthorized traffic. In addition, a firewall 160 will be used on the inbound and outbound segments to examine each data packet transmitted for proper authorization. The secured portion of the RSP web server 150, i.e, that portion which is access protected by passwords to authorized/registered users, will exist on a unique port 140 so that only traffic identifying that specific port 140 will be accepted. The transaction server(s) 180 will exist on a unique internet protocol ("IP") address(es) so that the outbound router 132 can filter out all traffic except to that

Art Unit: 3628

address. The transaction server 180 will also be configured to handle IP traffic only. The outbound router 132 and the firewall 160 will filter out all other Internet protocols according to industry standards for such firewalls. The PSP 4 also includes a series of data servers 170 (shown collectively in FIG. 2) that will be responsible for various dedicated functions. As the transaction server 180 receives a transaction request, the type of transaction is identified and processed using one of these servers as identified in the Table I below". It would have been obvious to combine Kovlakas and Lewis to disclose wherein executing the data processing circuitry on the postage-issuing computer system further causes the postage-issuing computer system to filter out the refunded postage purchase transactions from the duplicative postage purchase transactions to prevent the filtered postage purchase transactions from receiving multiple refunds.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to disclose the above limitation with the motivation of getting rid of duplicate postage.

As per claim 30, neither Kovlakas nor Williams et al nor Whitehouse specifically disclose but Gordon discloses that counterfeit indicia are identified through a comparison of the stored information in the master log database with information scanned from the mailpiece itself, and that counterfeits may also be detected by recognizing the multiple occurrences of identical indicia. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Kovlakas, Williams et al, Whitehouse and Gordon to

Art Unit: 3628

disclose wherein executing the data processing circuitry on the postage-issuing computer system further causes the postage-issuing computer system to associate the information stored for the plurality of postage purchase transactions with one or more user accounts.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose the above limitation with the motivation of determining if multiple transactions are processed at a time.

As per claim 31, Kovlakas discloses:

wherein the information stored for each of the plurality of postage purchase transactions further includes respective dates and the respective unique postage indicia for each of the plurality of postage purchase transactions, ([0014] Referring now to the drawings in detail, and more particularly to FIG. 1, the reference character 11 represents a mail piece that has a recipient address field 12 and a sender address field 13. A postal indicia 14 that was made by an electronic meter is affixed to mail piece 11. Indicia 14 contains a dollar amount 15; the date 16 that postal indicia 14 was affixed to mail piece).

As per claim 32, Kovlakas discloses: wherein the information stored for each of the plurality of postage purchase transactions further includes respective dates, respective times, destination zip codes, respective postage amounts, and the respective unique

Art Unit: 3628

postage indicia for each of the plurality of postage purchase transactions, ([0027] FIG. 5 is a flow chart for the recording and upload transactions of postal security device 45 and computer 47 of FIG. 3. In block 200 the print job begins, i.e., the printing of mail piece 21 including indicia 24. Then the program goes to decision block 201. Block 201 determines whether or not the print data is mail piece and postage information. If block 201 determines that the print data is not mail piece and postage information, the program goes back to the input of block 201. If block 201 determines that the print data is mail piece and postage information, the program goes to block 202. Block 202 will encrypt and save information that "uniquely" identifies mail piece 21, including information related to the mailer or personal computer meter such as the date and time that indicia 24 is produced;).

Kovlakas does not disclose a service class or a mail piece weight, however, Lewis discloses in col. 19, lines 5-18 "Additional information may be required such as the Class of postage by which the mail piece(s) will be shipped and the method of calculating the postage. The system may be established so that the user selects Calculate Weight, whereupon the number of sheets of paper being mailed and a paper weight (as indicated on the paper packaging (e.g., envelope, box, etc.)) are entered. A suitable application will then calculate the total weight by referring to an algorithm resident in the downloaded client software, for example, multiplying the single sheet paper weight by the number of sheets indicated. The result is then added to the weight of the packaging (e.g., an envelope) via a table look-up. The postage for that weight and class is then determined and the list of addresses is updated." It would have been

Art Unit: 3628

obvious to combine Kovlakas and Lewis to disclose a service class or a mail piece weight.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose a service class or a mail piece weight with the motivation of including standard mailpiece data with the postage purchase transaction.

As per claim 33, the combination of Kovlakas, Williams et al, and Whitehouse disclose all limitations as discussed with respect to claim 23 above.

As per claims 35, 45, Kovlakas discloses:

further comprising refunding the one or more duplicative postage purchase transactions associated with the unused unique postage indicia/wherein executing the data processing circuitry on the postage-issuing computer system further causes the postage-issuing computer system to refund the one or more duplicative postage purchase transactions associated with the unused unique postage indicia, (Fig. 6, [311], issue credit for postage amount scanned).

As per claim 38, Kovlakas discloses:

requesting confirmatory delivery status information associated with one or more of the respective unique tracking identifiers from a master tracking computer system

Art Unit: 3628

connected to the postage-issuing computer system through a communications link, (Fig 6, [308], this step determines if mailpiece has been mailed);

receiving the requested confirmatory delivery status information associated with the one or more respective unique tracking identifiers from the master tracking computer system, wherein the confirmatory delivery status information indicates whether the USPS has delivered one or ore mailpieces carrying the one or more respective unique tracking identifiers, (Fig 6, [308], this step determines if mailpiece has been mailed); and

updating the mailpiece delivery statuses respectivelty associated with the one or more respective unique tracking identifiers in the database with the confirmatory delivery status information received from the master tracking computer system(Fig 6, [310], void the transaction in the transaction log if it is determined that mailpiece has not been mailed).

As per claim 48, he combination of Kovlakas, Williams et al and Gordon discloses all limitations as discussed above with respect to claim 23, however, Whitehouse discloses:

checking for a change in the delivery status associated with the unique tracking identifier in response to refunding the postage purchase transaction, wherein the postage-issuing computer system checks for the change in the delivery, status during a period of time after the postage purchase transaction has been refunded, (Col. 2, lines 3-18 providing a signal). Whitehouse discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of

Art Unit: 3628

showing that a signal is provided indicative of the status of means for calculating postage.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose the limitation above with the motivation of determining the most up to date status of a refund.

As per claims 55/56, neither Kovlakas, Williams et al nor Gordon do not specifically disclose the following, however does disclose a system for issuing a refund for returned items in col. 10, line 61.

However, Whitehouse discloses:

the period of time comprises a predetermined number of days/months, (obvious with Col. 19, lines 20-23, month, col. 20, lines 16-21, day).

Whitehouse discloses the above limitations in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that the postal service can deal with a plurality of postage purchase transactions a given month or day.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the period of time to comprise a predetermined number of days/months with the motivation of processing postage purchase transactions for predetermined periods.

Art Unit: 3628

7. Claims 16, 19, 20, 28, 36, 37, 40, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovlakas (US 20030089765 A1), and further in view of Williams et al (US 7774284), and further in view of Whitehouse (US 6,005,945), and further in view of Gordon (6,527, 128), and further in view of Lewis et al (US 6233565).

As per claim 16, Kovlakas discloses:

wherein the information stored for the first postage purchase transaction further includes a first destination zip code, a first service class, a first postage amount, and the first unique postage indicium for the first postage purchase transaction, ([0027] FIG. 5 is a flow chart for the recording and upload transactions of postal security device 45 and computer 47 of FIG. 3. In block 200 the print job begins, i.e., the printing of mail piece 21 including indicia 24. Then the program goes to decision block 201. Block 201 determines whether or not the print data is mail piece and postage information. If block 201 determines that the print data is not mail piece and postage information, the program goes back to the input of block 201. If block 201 determines that the print data is mail piece and postage information, the program goes to block 202. Block 202 will encrypt and save information that "uniquely" identifies mail piece 21, including information related to the mailer or personal computer meter such as the date and time that indicia 24 is produced;).

Kovlakas does not disclose a service class or a mail piece weight, however, Lewis discloses in col. 19, lines 5-18 "Additional information may be required such as the Class of postage by which the mail piece(s) will be shipped and the method of

Art Unit: 3628

calculating the postage. The system may be established so that the user selects Calculate Weight, whereupon the number of sheets of paper being mailed and a paper weight (as indicated on the paper packaging (e.g., envelope, box, etc.)) are entered. A suitable application will then calculate the total weight by referring to an algorithm resident in the downloaded client software, for example, multiplying the single sheet paper weight by the number of sheets indicated. The result is then added to the weight of the packaging (e.g., an envelope) via a table look-up. The postage for that weight and class is then determined and the list of addresses is updated.” It would have been obvious to combine Kovlakas and Lewis to disclose a service class or a mail piece weight.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant’s invention to disclose a service class or a mail piece weight with the motivation of including standard mailpiece data with the postage purchase transaction.

Neither Kovlakas nor Lewis specifically disclose the following, however, Whitehouse discloses in the Abstract, lines 10-15, a database of information concerning user accounts [plural], and also, in Col. 28, lines 21-23, general postal indicia based on a plurality of user accounts, and also in Col. 25, lines 5-17, request a refund/issue a refund. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Kovlakas, Lewis and Whitehouse to disclose the following:

wherein the information stored for the second postage purchase transaction further includes a

Art Unit: 3628

second destination zip code, a second service class, a second postage amount, and the second unique postage indicium for the second postage purchase transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that the postal service can deal with a plurality of postage purchase transactions for a plurality of user accounts, and does not issue refunds for postage indicia that was previously used.

Neither Kovlakas, Lewis nor Whitehouse disclose a comparison between first and second transactions or wherein the first postage purchase transaction is refunded only in response, to further determining that the first destination zip code, the first service *class*, and the first postage amount for the first postage purchase transaction are the same as the second destination zip code, the second service class, and the second postage amount for the postage purchase transaction, however, in the abstract, Gordon discloses that counterfeit indicia are identified through a comparison of the stored information in the master log database with information scanned from the mailpiece itself, and that counterfeits may also be detected by recognizing the multiple occurrences of identical indicia. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Kovlakas, Lewis, Whitehouse and Gordon to disclose first and second transactions with the motivation of showing that multiple transaction data are detected for refund processing purposes and wherein the first postage purchase transaction is refunded only in response, to further determining that the first destination zip code, the first service *class*, and the first postage amount for the first postage purchase transaction

Art Unit: 3628

are the same as the second destination zip code, the second service class, and the second postage amount for the postage purchase transaction.

As per claims 19/20, Kovlakas does not specifically disclose wherein the refund inquiry is received from an account administrator that operates a user interface at the postage-issuing computer system, however, Lewis discloses in Col. 25, line 46, a system's administrator. It would have been obvious to combine Kovlakas and Lewis to disclose wherein the refund inquiry is received from an account administrator that operates a user interface at the postage-issuing computer system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the refund inquiry is received from an account administrator that operates a user interface at the postage-issuing computer system, with the motivation of providing an entity to take charge of processing.

As per claim 28, the combination of Kovlakas, Willimas et al, Whitehouse and Gordon disclose all limitations as discussed with respect to claim 23 above, and further: Kovlakas discloses data processing circuitry ...(abstract, processor).

Kovlakas does not specifically disclose the following however, Lewis discloses:
a database coupled to a postage-issuing computer system, (Lewis, abstract, transaction database);

a communications link ...(Lewis, abstract, communications link)

a master tracking computer system connected..to the postage-issuing computer system through the communications link, (col. 6, lines 63-65, master PSD); and

Art Unit: 3628

Lewis discloses the above limitations with the motivation of showing components used to process postage transaction.

As per claim 36, Kovlakas does not specifically disclose further comprising displaying the information stored for the plurality of postage purchase transactions at the postage-issuing computer system in response to the duplicative postage purchase transaction inquiry, however, Lewis does disclose a refund process where customer requests a full refund and a display screen assists the customer in doing so as shown in Col. 17, lines 41-66. It therefore would be obvious to combine Kovlakas and Lewis to disclose further comprising displaying the information stored for the plurality of postage purchase transactions at the postage-issuing computer system in response to the duplicative postage purchase transaction inquiry.

It would have been obvious to disclose further comprising displaying the information stored for the plurality of postage purchase transactions at the postage-issuing computer system in response to the duplicative postage purchase transaction inquiry with the motivation of providing a user with visual means to request and process a refund transaction.

As per claim 37, Kovlakas discloses: wherein the information stored for each of the plurality of postage purchase transactions further includes respective dates, respective destination zip, respective postage amounts, and the respective unique postage indicia for each of the plurality of postage purchase transactions, ([0027] FIG. 5

is a flow chart for the recording and upload transactions of postal security device 45 and computer 47 of FIG. 3. In block 200 the print job begins, i.e., the printing of mail piece 21 including indicia 24. Then the program goes to decision block 201. Block 201 determines whether or not the print data is mail piece and postage information. If block 201 determines that the print data is not mail piece and postage information, the program goes back to the input of block 201. If block 201 determines that the print data is mail piece and postage information, the program goes to block 202. Block 202 will encrypt and save information that "uniquely" identifies mail piece 21, including information related to the mailer or personal computer meter such as the date and time that indicia 24 is produced;).

Kovlakas does not disclose a service class or a mail piece weight, however, Lewis discloses in col. 19, lines 5-18 "Additional information may be required such as the Class of postage by which the mail piece(s) will be shipped and the method of calculating the postage. The system may be established so that the user selects Calculate Weight, whereupon the number of sheets of paper being mailed and a paper weight (as indicated on the paper packaging (e.g., envelope, box, etc.)) are entered. A suitable application will then calculate the total weight by referring to an algorithm resident in the downloaded client software, for example, multiplying the single sheet paper weight by the number of sheets indicated. The result is then added to the weight of the packaging (e.g., an envelope) via a table look-up. The postage for that weight and class is then determined and the list of addresses is updated." It would have been

Art Unit: 3628

obvious to combine Kovlakas and Lewis to disclose a service class or a mail piece weight.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose a service class or a mail piece weight with the motivation of including standard mailpiece data with the postage purchase transaction.

As per claims 40, 41, Kovlakas does not specifically disclose wherein the duplicative postage transaction inquiry is received from an account administrator that operates a user interface at the postage-issuing; computer system, however, Lewis discloses in Col. 25, line 46, a system's administrator. It would have been obvious to combine Kovlakas and Lewis to disclose wherein the duplicative postage transaction inquiry is received from an account administrator that operates a user interface at the postage-issuing; computer system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the refund inquiry is received from an account administrator that operates a user interface at the postage-issuing computer system, with the motivation of providing an entity to take charge of processing.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 12-24, 26-38, 40-42, 44, 45, and 55-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5:30pm.

Art Unit: 3628

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

- Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

A. R. B.
August 1, 2011

/Akiba K Robinson-Boyce/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628